

ARC920000017US1
09/788,636

screen edge, and therefore must be accommodated for in the mating device with a corresponding cut-out area. These male and female shapes provide the added advantage of a visual cue as to how the two devices connect.

In the Claims

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 11-13, 25-29, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Latocha et al. (5,790,371).

Claims 8-10, 14-24, 30-32, and 24-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Latocha et al. in view of Ohgami et al. (5,574,625).

The claims have been amended to provide substantive structural elements of originally claimed and disclosed embodiments. The Latocha et al. and Ohgami references fail to provide or suggest the movable cabinet structure which enables coplanar abutment of similar portable processing devices. While the Ohgami reference does provide for a removable connector door (well known), the connectors and movable door are not configured to enable physical abutment of two similar display devices. The devices need to have a physical connection along the display surface, however, Ohgami is limited to plug-in type connectors (including cards or cords) on the backside of the device (also well known). As shown in Ohgami, the display surface supporting cabinet remains complete on the top surface 11, thus Ohgami could never allow the display edges of two devices to abut. Neither Latocha et al., nor Ohgami provides or suggests a teaching within the references themselves on how one would modify Ohgami to enable removal of the top cabinet structure, nor would it have been obvious to have done so. Additionally, separate from the movable cabinet structure are physical mating structures (see original drawings - figure 2c (element 106a)) which assist in aligning the two structures together (neither of which are taught